



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/653,713	09/05/2000	Stephen R. Carter	6647-15	8261

20575 7590 11/03/2004

MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM PC
1030 SW MORRISON STREET
PORTLAND, OR 97205

EXAMINER

SPOONER, LAMONT M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2654

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/653,713

Applicant(s)

CARTER ET AL.

Examiner

Lamont M Spooner

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 September 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 September 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2, 3</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The referenced US application titled, A METHOD AND MECHANISM FOR THE CREATION, MAINTENANCE, AND COMPARISON OF SEMANTIC ABSTRACTS, page 1 and 3 of the specification, does not contain the US patent application serial number, or file date and thereby will not be considered as incorporated into the application

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 6-13, 15-22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicant does not describe how to construct an impact summary using selected chains.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 19 recites the limitation "the state vectors" in claim 19, page 14, line 2.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-5, 14-16, and 23, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conklin et al. (herein referred to as Conklin, US Patent No. 6,363,378 filed Oct. 13, 1998) in view of Luciw et al. (herein referred to as Luciw, US Patent No. 5,390,281 Feb. 14, 1995).

Conklin and Luciw are analogous art in that they involve computer implemented information comparison.

As per **claims 1, 14, and 23**, Conklin discloses a computer-implemented method for building a template specifying an emotional response to a content stream, the method comprising:

selecting a dictionary, the dictionary including a plurality of concepts (Fig. 3 item 200, C.10.lines 31-51), one concept identified as a maximal element, and a plurality of chains connecting the maximal element to each concept in the directed set (C.7.lines 39-50, dictionary-C.12.lines 1-45);

selecting a set of intentional stance basis chains to form a basis (Fig. 6, C.12.lines 1-18-"places of interest" is a subcategory under the category "tourisim", "is a" being the basis, each chain contains the basis, "is a" as a categorical relation to it's parent, thus forming an intentional stance basis chain);

Art Unit: 2654

selecting at least one concept in the dictionary (Fig. 5 items 410-490);

creating a state vector in a topological vector space for each selected concept (C.4.lines 39-C.5.line 15-document theme vector), wherein each state vector includes as at least one measure of how concretely the concept is represented in each chain in the basis (C.7.line 62-C.9.line 26-each theme/node vector, interpreted as state vectors contain a parent and descendant weight identifying how concretely the concept is represented in each chain in the basis); and

Conklin does not disclose:

assembling the state vectors into a template; and

associating an action with the template.

However, Luciw teaches assembling information into a template and associating an action with the template (C.8.lines 3-55, C.11.lines 10-32). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Conklin with Luciw by placing the state vectors into a template and associating an action with the template. The motivation for doing so would have been to generate templates which contain directed information slots to perform a task upon meeting satisfying conditions (C.7.lines 55-63, C.11.lines 21-32).

As per **claim 2**, Conklin and Luciw disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 2 depends. Conklin does not disclose:

associating an action includes assigning a threshold distance to the action so that the action will be performed when the content stream is within the threshold distance of the template.

Art Unit: 2654

However, Luciw teaches (C.13.lines 13-41) associating an action includes assigning a threshold distance to the action so that the action will be performed when the content stream is within the threshold distance of the template (C.13.lines 1-25, the weight measures/defines the distance). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Conklin with Luciw by including a threshold distance the action associated with the template. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a threshold level to initiate an action automatically (C.13.lines 26-34).

As per **claim 3**, Conklin and Luciw disclose all of the limitations of claim 2, upon which claim 3 depends. Conklin does not disclose:

associating an action includes associating a plurality of actions with the template;
and

assigning a threshold distance includes assigning a unique threshold distance to each action so that the action will be performed when the content stream is within the assigned threshold distance of the template.

However, Luciw teaches associating an action includes associating a plurality of actions with the template (C.11.lines 10-20, associated action includes, faxing, filing, scheduling) and assigning a threshold distance includes assigning a unique threshold distance to each action so that the action will be performed when the content stream is within the assigned threshold distance of the template (C.13.lines 1-54, C.17, C.18-each action has an unique Max threshold level which initiates the template associated action, C.17.lines 43-45). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2654

one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Conklin with Luciw by assigning unique thresholds associated with actions which are associated with a template for performance when a content stream is within threshold distance to the template. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the threshold to be set to a particular level that will enable a unique action to be performed (C.17.lines 1-18).

As per **claim 4**, Conklin and Luciw disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 4 depends. Conklin does not disclose:

assigning an action includes assigning a plurality of actions to be performed when the content stream is within one of a plurality of threshold distances of the template each action to be performed when the content stream is within a unique range of distances of the template.

However, Luciw teaches assigning an action includes assigning a plurality of actions to be performed when the content stream (C.16.lines 54, 55) is within one of a plurality of threshold distances of the template (C.16.lines 54-68, C.17.lines 1-18), each action to be performed when the content stream is within a unique range of distances of the template (C.13.lines 28-30, user defines unique threshold value before each action is to be performed). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Conklin with Luciw by assigning a plurality of actions to be performed when a content stream is within a unique threshold distance of a template. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the threshold to be set to a particular level that will enable a unique action from a plurality of actions to be performed (C.17.lines 1-18), at each threshold level.

Art Unit: 2654

As per **claim 5**, Conklin and Luciw disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 5 depends. Conklin further discloses:

constructing a centroid vector from the state vectors (C.6.lines 1-51, C.6.lines 52-64, cluster/focal vector, see clustering discussion C.7-C.10).

Conklin does not disclose.

constructing a centroid vector for the template from the state vectors.

However, Luciw teaches (C.8.lines 34-62) having a template, which contains centroidal data (C.7.line 55-C.8.line 62). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Conklin with Luciw by building a centroid vector for the template from state vectors. The motivation for doing so would have been to construct a template that contained information relating to a centroid concept (C.8.lines 34-55).

As per **claim 15**, Conklin and Luciw disclose all of the limitations of claim 14, upon which claim 15 depends. Conklin does not disclose:

a threshold distance for the template; and

means for performing the action associated with the template when an impact summary of the content stream is within the threshold distance of the template.

However, Luciw teaches (C.13.lines 1-25, the weight measures/defines the distance) having a threshold distance for the template and performing the action associated with the template when an impact summary of the content stream (C.11.lines 4-55, the Significant Object set, constructed from the content stream, is interpreted as the impact summary) is within the threshold distance of the template

Art Unit: 2654

(C.13.lines 13-41). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Conklin with Luciw by having a threshold distance for a template, wherein an action associated with the template is performed when an impact summary of the content stream is within a threshold distance of the template. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a threshold level to initiate an action automatically (C.13.lines 26-34).

As per **claim 16**, Conklin and Luciw disclose all of the limitations of claim 15, upon which claim 16 depends. Conklin does not disclose:

the threshold distance includes a plurality of threshold distances for the template;
the action includes a plurality of actions associated with the template; and
the means for performing the action includes means for performing one of the plurality of actions when the impact summary of the content stream is within one of the threshold distances of the template.

However, Luciw teaches the threshold distance includes a plurality of threshold distances for the template (C.13.lines 28-30, user defines unique threshold values before each action is to be performed, C.17-C.18, plurality of thresholds values set for each action); and performing the action includes performing one of the plurality of actions when the impact summary of the content stream (C.11.lines 4-55, the Significant Object set, constructed from the content stream, is interpreted as the impact summary, C.16.lines 54, 55-content stream) is within one of the threshold distances of the template (C.16.lines 54-68, C.17.lines 1-18). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Conklin with Luciw

Art Unit: 2654

by performing one of a plurality of actions associated with a template when an impact summary of a content stream is within one of a plurality of threshold distances of a template.. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the threshold to be set to a particular level that will enable an action from a plurality of actions to be performed (C.17.lines 1-18), at threshold levels due to the summarization of content.

8. Claims 6-11, 13, 17-22, and 24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luciw in view of Castelli et al. (herein referred to as Castelli, US Patent No. 6,122,628, Oct. 31, 1997).

Luciw and Castelli are analogous art in that they involve computer implemented information comparison.

As per **claim 6, 17 and 24**, Luciw discloses a computer implemented method for comparing a template with a content stream to determine whether the content stream provokes an emotion response, the method comprise:

constructing the template, the template including an associated action (C.13.lines 13-41) and threshold distance (C.13.lines 1-25, the weight measures/defines the distance).

constructing a summary for the content stream (C.10.lines 12-53-Significant object (SO) set is interpreted as the summary);

comparing the summary with the template (C.12.lines 24-62);

Luciw does not disclose:

constructing the template in a topological vector space, the template including an associated action and threshold distance;

Art Unit: 2654

constructing an impact summary for the content stream; and
comparing the impact summary with the template.

However, Castelli teaches (C.9.lines 45-53, Fig. 5) constructing a template in a topological vector space, constructing an impact summary for a content stream (C.11.line 9-C.12.line 61-through singular value decomposition, from a content stream, a reduced dimension cluster is generated, which is interpreted as the impact summary from vector information in a topological vector space), and comparing the impact summary with the template (Fig. 5). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Luciw with Castelli by constructing a template have an associated action and threshold distance, in a topological vector space. The motivation for doing so would have been to measure the distance between the template and another object in a topological vector space order to detect similarity (C.5.lines 12-20, C.7.lines 17-20, C.9.lines 55-60).

As per **claims 7 and 18**, Luciw and Castelli disclose all of the limitations of claim 6, upon which claim 7 depends. Luciw further discloses:

comparing the summary with the template (C.12.lines 24-62);

Luciw does not disclose:

comparing the impact summary with the template includes measuring a distance between the impact summary and the template.

However, Castelli teaches (C.9.line 16-C.10.line 56) measuring a distance between a impact summary and a template (Fig. 5). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Luciw

with Castelli by measuring a distance between the impact summary and the template. The motivation for doing so would have been to use distance, which is the most commonly used similarity measure between two vectors, to determine the similarity between an impact summary and a template (C.7.lines 52-61).

As per **claim 8**, Luciw and Castelli disclose all of the limitations of claim 7, upon which claim 8 depends. Luciw does not disclose:

measuring a distance includes performing a topological vector space transformation on the impact summary.

However, Castelli teaches (C.11.lines 9-54-transformation matrix) measuring a distance includes performing a topological vector space transformation on the impact summary. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Luciw with Castelli by performing a topological vector space transformation on the impact summary. The motivation for doing so would have been to include the impact summary in a topological vector space for use in precision for vector matching and recall purposes (C.11.lines 25-40).

As per **claims 9 and 21**, Luciw and Castelli disclose all of the limitations of claim 7, upon which claim 9 depends. Luciw further discloses:

performing the action associated with the template (C.16.lines 64-67) if the distance between the summary and the template (C.13.lines 13-15)) is less than the threshold distance of the template (C.17.lines 1-18).

Luciw does not disclose:

the summary is an impact summary.

Art Unit: 2654

However, Castelli teaches constructing an impact summary (C.6.lines 6-21).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Luciw with Castelli by incorporating an impact summary. The motivation for doing so would have been to measure the distance between the template and an impact summary in a topological vector space order to detect similarity (C.5.lines 12-20, C.7.lines 17-20, C.9.lines 55-60) in order to determine an appropriate action to perform.

As per **claims 10 and 19**, Luciw and Castelli disclose all of the limitations of claim 7, upon which claim 10 depends. Luciw does not disclose:

measuring a distance includes locating a centroid vector for each of the template and the impact summary.

However, Castelli teaches (Fig. 5, C.9.line 15-C.10.line 56, centroidal clusters are centroid 1, centroid 2, "produce a representative vector for each cluster). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Luciw with Castelli by measuring a distance between the centroid of a template and impact summary. The motivation for doing so would have been to generate a searchable index based on centroidal information (C.10.lines 42-56).

As per **claim 11**, Luciw and Castelli disclose all of the limitations of claim 10, upon which claim 11 depends. Luciw does not disclose:

measuring a distance further includes measuring an angle between the template centroid vector and the impact summary centroid vector.

However, Castelli teaches (Fig. 5, C.9.lines 62-66) measuring a distance further includes measuring an angle between the template centroid vector and the impact summary centroid vector. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Luciw with Castelli by measuring an angle between the template centroid vector and the impact summary centroid vector. The motivation for doing so would have been to an angle method of measuring distance, which is a commonly used similarity and distance measure between two vectors, to determine the similarity between an impact summary centroid and a template centroid (C.7.lines 52-61).

As per **claim 13**, Luciw and Castelli disclose all of the limitations of claim 6, upon which claim 13 depends. Luciw does not disclose:

constructing an impact summary includes iteratively constructing the impact summary for the content stream to track changes in the content stream.

However, Castelli teaches (C.12.lines 34-39) constructing an impact summary includes iteratively constructing the impact summary for the content stream to track changes in the content stream. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Luciw with Castelli by iteratively constructing an impact summary of a content stream. The motivation for doing so would have been to track the precision of the changes in the impact summary as the content stream varies in order to recall pertinent information (C.12.lines 28-39).

As per **claim 20**, Luciw and Castelli disclose all of the limitations of claim 19, upon which claim 20 depends. Luciw does not disclose:

the means for measuring a distance between the impact summary and the template includes means for measuring a Euclidean distance between the impact summary and the template.

However, Castelli teaches (C.9.line 16-C.10.line 56) the means for measuring a distance between the impact summary and the template includes means for measuring a Euclidean distance (C.9.lines 45-55, C.14.lines 27-67-Euclidean distance measured from the template vector and the dimension reduction information interpreted as the impact summary) between the impact summary and the template. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Luciw with Castelli by measuring an Euclidean distance between an impact summary and a template. The motivation for doing so would have been to use a well know method of Euclidean distance, which is a common used distance measuring method between two vectors, to determine the similarity between an impact summary and a template (C.7.lines 52-61).

As per **claim 22**, Luciw and Castelli disclose all of the limitations of claim 17, upon which claim 22 depends. Luciw does not disclose:

the impact summary uses a basis including a second subset of the plurality of vectors; and

the apparatus includes a transformer for performing a topological vector space transformation on the impact summary.

However, Castelli teaches having the impact summary using a basis including a second subset of the plurality of vectors (C.11.lines 25-40-the subset of ordered

eigenvalues in the vector space) and including a transformer for performing a topological vector space transformation on the impact summary (C.11.lines 9-53-transformation matrix). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Luciw with Castelli by having a basis with an impact summary and performing a topological vector space transformation on the impact summary. The motivation for doing so would have been to increase precision in similarity and recall (C.11.lines 35-40).

9. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luciw in view of Castelli et al. and further in view of Huttenlocher.

Luciw, Castelli and Huttenlocher are analogous art in that they involve computer implemented information comparison.

As per **claim 12**, Luciw and Castelli disclose all of the limitations of claim 7, upon which claim 12 depends. Luciw in view of Castelli does not disclose:

measuring a distance includes measuring a Hausdorff distance between the impact summary and the template.

However, Huttenlocher teaches employing the Hausdorff distance as a measuring technique to determine the closeness of word images or units/abstracts of understanding (Abstract, C.12.lines 1-9). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Luciw, and Castelli with Huttenlocher by measuring a Hausdorff distance between an impact summary and a template. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine how close two sets of information were in accordance with one another in a set space, because using the

Hausdorff distance specializes in determining a measure for comparing point sets (C.13.lines 53-55).

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Caid (US Patent No. 5,619,709 Apr. 8, 1997) teaches constructing an impact summary for a content stream, by singular value decomposition, constructing a centroid vector for the impact summary and comparing the impact summary with another vector represented object, and using a Euclidean method of measuring similarity between clusters and centroid vectors, and retrieving information based on a level of matching, interpreted as an associated action based on a similarity measure.
- Hazlehurst et al. (US Patent No. 6,289,353 filed Jun. 10, 1999) teaches measuring distance includes measuring an angle between two vectors.
- Tso (US Patent No. 6,085,201 Jul. 4, 2000) teaches comparing a template with a content stream to determine whether the content stream provokes a response.
- Ueda (US Patent No. 6,493,663 filed Dec. 7, 1999) teaches developing an impact summary from a content stream.


Art Unit: 2654

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lamont M Spooner whose telephone number is 703/305-8661. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 703/305-9645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

lms
10/1/04



PATRICK N. EDOUARD
PRIMARY EXAMINER